



DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 19

Meeting Date: 3/14/07

Issue Date: 4/2/07

The contents of this summary are assumed correct unless our office is notified in writing within five calendar days of receipt.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY-EMT #19

Project: I-5 to 99W Connector
Purpose: Executive Management Team Meeting
Location: Metro Council Chambers

Attendees:

EMT	Andy Cotugno	Metro
	Danielle Cowan	City of Wilsonville (alternate)
	Rob Dixon	City of Sherwood
	Fred Eberle	ODOT
	Jeff Graham	FHWA
	Mike McKillip	City of Tualatin
	Lawrence Odell	Washington County (EMT Chair)
	R. Scott Pemble	Clackamas County
	Mike Stone	City of Wilsonville
PMT	Vaughn Brown	Jeanne Lawson Associates (JLA)
	Amy Gibbons	ODOT
	Leslie Howell	Howell Consulting
	Angie Jones	DEA
	Jef Kaiser	DEA
	Russell Knoebel	Washington County (PMT Chair)
	Scott Richman	DEA
	Mark Turpel	Metro
	Tim Wilson	ODOT
Others	Tom Aufenthie	SWG
	Mike Feves	SWG
	Ron Johnson	SWG
	Claude Roherbach	
	Debra Roherbach	

Distribution: PMT, EMT, Interested Parties, File

The meeting began at 1:30 PM. The agenda and other materials were provided to EMT members in electronic format prior to the meeting and copies were distributed at the meeting. The agenda items are represented in "bold" headings.

- **Welcome and Introductions**

- Lawrence welcomed the group and led self-introductions of meeting attendees.
- He referred to an updated project contact list that was provided along with the agenda and other meeting materials.

- **Discuss Approach to Develop Initial ROA**

- Danielle voiced concern with the screening matrix reference to “scoring” elements against the screening criteria (e.g., element 8 contains reference to “scoring poorly”). She has not seen measurable scoring results. Jef K. agreed that “scoring” is not the most appropriate term, since the screening was primarily based on the collective professional judgment of consultants and agency staff.
- Mike S. asked for clarification between the two screening matrices, and Jef replied that the matrix dated March 12 incorporated the EMT input from their last meeting held March 9th including the two new EMT-proposed elements numbered 26 and 27. The earlier matrix was the same version that the EMT had prior to their March 9th meeting with 25 elements.
- Danielle inquired about the origin of the definition of “connector”, and Jef replied that it is used in the Regional Transportation Plan (RTP). Danielle expressed concern that the ROA will be limited to connectors as identified in the current RTP while the RTP is being amended, and Metro’s transportation policy emphasis is less on large highways and more on enhancements to the existing system. Andy advised that arterial type connectors, and not just limited access expressway facilities be considered in the ROA.
- Lawrence opened an updated concept screening PowerPoint presentation. He requested that the EMT allow Jef K. to go through the presentation of concept solution elements, and then discuss specific concept elements. A similar version of this presentation will be used for the upcoming SWG meeting on March 22nd, and the next PSC meeting on March 28th.
- Jef presented the elements to be carried forward as primary connector solutions (color-coded green), elements to be carried forward in combination with others to support various alternatives (color-coded yellow). Andy noted two needed EMT actions: one to agree on recommended elements to eliminate for further study (color-coded red), and the other to agree on elements to carry forward for development into the initial ROA. Jef said to give us the best tools to move ahead with ROA development, it would be ideal to get PSC consensus on elements to eliminate from further study.
- Edits to slides were recorded, and will be incorporated prior to the presentation at the March 22nd SWG meeting. EMT discussion of slides representing individual concept elements follows.
- **Element 1** (southern connector). Jef noted that element 1 emulates the south alignment included in the current adopted RTP. Mike M. asked if one midpoint interchange is assumed as part of this element, and Jef clarified that the box diagram shown on this and other elements is representative of local access provision between I-5 and 99W, and not a precise location of a proposed intersection or interchange. ODOT access spacing standards would also limit the number of access points for a new state highway facility between I-5 and 99W.

- **Element 3** (connector south of project solution area). Russ noted an edit to the second bullet – need to show as “Newburg-Dundee”. Andy asked if there was a record of decision (ROD) on the Newburg-Dundee Bypass project. Fred replied that a Draft Location Environmental Impact Statement (LEIS) was prepared. A ROD would follow completion of a design-level EIS. Fred suggested edits to the second bullet on this slide to clarify that this concept was eliminated through the N-D Bypass study.
- **Element 4** (power line corridor connector). Lawrence asked if mid-point access should be indicated on element 4, and Jef agreed this would be appropriate.
- **Element 5** (Improve capacity on I-5 through project area). Danielle does not agree with first and fourth bullets on this slide: “Does not improve connectivity between I-5 and 99W” and “Does not relieve congestion on 99W north of T-S Rd.” Danielle said she believes that Tigard’s Town Center would be improved by 99W improvements being made.
- **Element 6** (Improve capacity on 99W to continue as the state highway connection to I-5 and the Portland metro area). Danielle does not agree with second bullet on this slide: “Significant land use and traffic impacts to the 2040 designated Tigard Town Center.”
- Discussion about elements 5 and 6:
 - Fred said there are studies to improve both I-5 and 99W, and they are not part of this project. He does not believe that improvements to I-5 and to 99W will address the Purpose and Need for the Connector Project.
 - Jeff G. said that any alternative is going to have to work with I-5 and 99W. He suggested that elements five and six could be added to the yellow-coded elements to study as part of the ROA.
 - Rob said his concern is that we are supposed to screen these according to the purpose and need and criteria, and we have not been doing our part if we do not hold ourselves to this approach.
- **Element 8** (Connector in the Tualatin Rd. corridor). Danielle suggested that if we carry forward elements that connect to I-5 south of I-205, it seems that connections north of I-205 should also be studied.
- **Element 9** (Connector between 99W in southern Sherwood and I-5 at Boeckman Rd.). Discussion about element 9:
 - Danielle presented and handed out maps showing planned development and land uses in the vicinity of Boeckman Rd. to illustrate concerns Wilsonville has about a connector to a new Boeckman Rd. interchange west of I-5. It would impact the future expansion of Wilsonville’s Town Center, and she does not see how it could be considered as a reasonable option with required out-of-direction movement for travel between 99W south of Sherwood and I-5 north of T-S Rd. including freight travel. She does not understand how the out-of-direction travel for element 25 which was not recommended to be further studied is much different from element 9. Element 9 appears to be a solution to relieve congestion in Tualatin and Sherwood that would impact Wilsonville. Danielle referred to an article in the Wilsonville Spokesman that quoted SWG representative, Tom Sullivan who had expressed concern that four out of five elements proposed to be developed into alternatives would connect to I-5 near Wilsonville.

DRAFT MEETING SUMMARY

ODOT0000-0526

MS: 19

Meeting Date: 3/14/07

Issue Date: 4/2/07

- Jef reminded that this and other options were identified from people who provided input at the community forums. He spoke with multiple people at the Wilsonville open house who suggested this concept.
- Lawrence asked what the downside of rejecting element nine would be.
- Jef answered that the PMT would have no objection to dropping it. Part of the reason for carrying it forward was to acknowledge some public opinions for considering this concept.
- Mark said the reason the distinction was made between Wilsonville and Tualatin's Town Centers was made due to the difference between the designated Town Center areas shown on the Metro 2040 Growth Concept map.
- Mike M. said procedurally, we have to provide public input opportunity which we did. If the EMT recommends eliminating it versus advancing it to PSC with comments, is that fully considering? He does not want to have to loop back later and need to study it.
- Fred said he is inclined to recommend eliminating element 9 from further study. It is about two miles south of the other concept connections to I-5 near Norwood Rd. (out-of-direction) and earlier traffic studies have indicated that a Boeckman Rd. interchange is too far south to attract substantial demand. He questioned whether this alignment could also have greater impact to rural agricultural land outside of the UGB than other concepts located further north. Fred questioned whether it would be a NEPA procedural problem to drop this.
- Jef K. replied that he does not believe that it would be a problem since the NEPA process required study of a reasonable range of alternatives.
- Jeff G. said that if we discard any option with a Boeckman Rd. interchange, we need to have valid reasoning behind this recommendation. He also questioned why this concept would not connect to the Elligsen Rd. interchange rather than Boeckman Rd. He agreed that considering other concepts that would out-perform this element would be enough cause to not carry if forward.
- Mike S. said that Wilsonville is already cut in half by I-5, and if this element were implemented, it would also be bisected by this connector.
- R. Scott P. said travel demand modeling of element 1 may provide clarification on the demand threshold for effectiveness of a new east-west connection located south of Sherwood.
- **Element 10** (major arterial between I-205 and the N-D Bypass using the Stafford Rd. corridor [paralleling I-5]). Mike S. asked where element 10 would connect to I-5, and Jef replied that the person he spoke with at an open house suggested that this concept would be a parallel road extending south from the I-205/Stafford Rd. interchange that would connect to the N-D Bypass, and not necessarily link to I-5.
- **Element 12** (124th extension to I-5). Rob Dixon sought confirmation that element 12 would not preclude a different alignment that could also support a connector, and Jef replied that this was the case.

- **Element 19** (Improve T-S Rd. to serve as a state highway level connector between I-5 and 99W). Andy requested that this element be described as a “fully limited access connector” instead of “state highway”.
 - **Element 27** (Improve T-S Rd. as an arterial/expressway hybrid). Lawrence suggested adding a footnote to this element to distinguish between it and other T-S Rd. elements 18 and 19.
 - Lawrence recommended adding a last slide that identifies the EMT recommendation to the PSC for elements to eliminate from further study.
 - Danielle noted that it seems that no connector option could work by itself. They each would seem to need to connect to T-S Rd. to function effectively
 - Mike M. said that the new City Manager and two new city councilors in Tualatin want him to clearly tell them what we are recommending. He suggested that we identify right from the start the requested action of the PSC. He said we need to clarify to the PSC how the ROA will be developed. May or may not include all yellows and greens and may include other elements not identified by stakeholders. He commented that the slides showing elements connection points to I-5 are different on different maps, and suggested that they show more consistent interchange connection locations since it is recognized that the viable connection locations are limited.
 - Jef said that at the PSC meeting, we need their consensus on elements to eliminate from further study, then we will focus on developing an initial ROA. When we refine the elements into initial alternatives, the likely footprint of the interchange area will be more clear.
 - Lawrence summarized what he heard from the EMT today: elimination of elements color-coded red in the presentation (elements 3, 5, 6, 8, 10, 13, 19, and 25), and eliminate element 9.
 - The EMT unanimously moved to recommend elimination of these nine elements.
 - Fred raised concern about how this will affect the scope and budget
 - Scott P. asked if it is not only our expectation to connect “point A and point B”, but if we also need to recommend on mid-point access locations. Jef replied that this will need to be addressed in the ROA.
 - Andy asked if the memo from the EMT to the PSC is going to limit ROA types four and five to freeway-type facilities. If so, the Metro Council will reject this recommendation. Since the project did not achieve the needed Goal Exception for the RTP, we are required to consider less intensive facility options than limited access freeways. He requested that the definition of “Connector” not preclude arterial type connections. Strike “expressway” and insert “partially or fully limited access highway” into the definition.
 - The EMT unanimously agreed to accept Andy’s proposed change to the definition of “Connector”.
 - The revised screening matrix will be distributed to the EMT in electronic format.
- **Other business**
 - The next EMT meeting is tentatively scheduled to be held on April 5th 9:30 am - 11:30 am.